

24854A

REMARKS**Status of Claims**

Claims 1-15 are pending in the instant application. Claims 16-20 stand withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-15 stand rejected. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-15 stand objected to as claims 2-15 are dependent on claim 1 which refers to reinforcing fibers and not the "product". Claims 3, 8 and 11 have been canceled herein. Applicants have amended claims 2, 4-7, 9-10 and 12-13 incorporating the Examiner's suggestion of deleting the word "product" in claims 2, 4-7, 9-10 and 12-13 and adding the phrase "reinforcing fibers". Applicants note that claims 14 and 15 do not refer to the term "product" and therefore have not been amended. Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 1-15 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 3, 8 and 11 under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 3, 8, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner objects to the use of trademarks/tradenames in these claims (PE412 in Claim 3; Duracet 675-01 in Claim 8; and Carbopol 941 and 981 in Claim 11).

Applicants have canceled claims 3, 8 and 11 herein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 3, 8 and 11 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-2, 6-7 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-2, 6-7 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dana et al. (U.S. 5,908,689).

24854A

The Examiner states that Dana discloses reinforcing fibers such as glass strands wherein an aqueous chemical treatment, which is dried, is applied to the fibers. The Examiner states that Dana discloses that the film former is a vinyl polymer such as polyvinyl acetate.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that the film former is an "epoxidized polyvinyl acetate" film former. No new matter has been added and support for the amended can be found in the specification at page 5, paragraph 4. Claim 7 has been canceled herein.

Nowhere does Dana teach or suggest reinforcing fibers having an applied chemical treatment applied as an aqueous treatment including an epoxidized polyvinyl acetate film former. Dana specifically teaches adding a polyvinyl acetate copolymer emulsion to an aqueous composition.

Claims 3, 8 and 11 have been canceled herein. Claims 2, 4-7, 9-10 and 12-15 ultimately depend from claim 1 (as amended) and contain the limitations thereof. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 102(b) rejection of claims 1-2, 6-7 and 12-14 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Temple (U.S. 5,130,197) in view of Eichhorn et al. (U.S. 4,596,736) and further in view of Manufacturing Technology of Continuous Glass Fibers (3rd Edition, 1993).

The Examiner states that Temple discloses a chemically treated fibrous substrate such as glass reinforced fiber strands. The Examiner states that Temple discloses that the treatment discloses an emulsified polyester resin, a film former of polyvinyl acetate and deionized water. The Examiner further states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use PE412 and Duracet 675-01, as they are well known in the art as an emulsified polyester resin and polyvinyl acetate respectively widely used for chemical treatment of glass fibers. The Examiner states that Eichhorn teaches that thickeners and crosslinking agents such as dieumyl peroxide may be used. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary